

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested. In the present response, claims 1-10 have been canceled, and new claims 11-19 have been added. Claims 11-19 remain pending in this application.

Formal matters

The Drawings have been objected to because Figs. 1 and 2A-2C are not labeled correctly. In response, Applicant has amended Figs. 1 and 2A-2C to include the legend –Prior Art–. A corrected drawing sheet (labeled “Replacement Sheet”) that incorporates the aforementioned changes is attached herein as an appendix (immediately following page 13).

The Abstract of the Disclosure has been objected to because of the presence of the phrase “means of” at lines 11-12. In response, Applicant has requested deletion of “means of.” Accordingly, the Abstract of the Disclosure is now believed to be in compliance with all formal requirements.

The Specification has been objected to because of the reference to “figure 3” on page 6, line 1; Applicant notes that Examiner has mistakenly referred to line 5, rather than line 1. In response, and in accordance with Examiner’s suggestion, Applicant has requested that “figure 3 shows” be changed to --figures 3a, 3b, and 3c show--.

Claims 1 and 4-6 have been objected to due to various informalities. These objections are moot in view of Applicant’s cancellation of those claims.

New claims 11-19 have been carefully drafted and are believed to be in compliance with all formal requirements.

Substantive matters

Claims 1-6 and 9-10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bessone (U.S. Patent 4,010,399). Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Bessone in view of Pak (U.S. Patent 6,731,075). Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Bessone in view of Nostwick (U.S. Patent 6,724,152). These rejections are moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of claims 1-10.

Instead of attempting to amend certain of the claims 1-10 (the language of which appear to be less than clear in at least some instances), Applicant has chosen to cancel those claims and to present new claims 11-19. New claims 11-19 have been carefully drafted in order to more clearly distinguish over Bessone, Pak, Nostwick, and the other references of record.

Independent claim 11 is specifically directed to the embodiment described in Fig. 3a. Claim 11 is clearly distinct and nonobvious over Bessone and the other references of record because none of the references (taken individually or in combination) disclose the specific structure recited in claim 11. For example, claim 11 recites an arrangement that includes a current control device (PTC), a secondary coil (La), and a heating transformer that includes a primary coil (Lhp). Significantly, claim 11 recites that the secondary coil (La) is electrically coupled to the current control device (PTC), and that the primary coil (Lhp) is coupled in series with the secondary coil (La) and the current control device (PTC). Thus, the secondary coil (La), the primary coil (Lhp), and the current control device (PTC) form a series circuit. None of the references of record, either individually or in combination, disclose such a series circuit arrangement.

Applicant notes that neither Pak nor Nostwick appear to teach anything analogous to the structural recitations of claim 11. Moreover, although Bessone appears to be concerned with the same general problem as Applicant's invention (i.e., supplying and controlling heater current to

lamp filaments), Bessone does not teach any structure that is identical or similar to the aforementioned series circuit arrangement. More particularly, Bessone appears to teach an arrangement wherein multiple solid-state switching networks (e.g., S1,S2,S3,S4) are used to directly interrupt the supply of heating current to the lamp filaments; that is quite different from the specific arrangement recited in claim 11. Accordingly, claim 11 is distinct and nonobvious over Bessone, Pak, and Nostwick, as well as all hypothetical combinations thereof. Therefore, claim 11 should be deemed allowable.

Claims 12 and 13 are dependent on claim 11, and are therefore allowable on the same basis as claim 11. Moreover, claims 12 and 13 include additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claim 11, render those claims further distinct and nonobvious over the references or record. Accordingly, claims 12 and 13 should likewise be deemed allowable.

Independent claim 14 is specifically directed to the embodiment described in Fig. 3b. As claim 14 is substantially similar to claim 11 (the only substantive difference being that claim 14 recites first and second resonant inductors [LRes1,LRes2]), Applicant's previous distinguishing remarks regarding claim 11 are equally applicable to claim 14 and thus incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, claim 14 should be deemed allowable for the same reasons as claim 11.

Claims 15 and 16 are dependent on claim 14, and are therefore allowable on the same basis as claim 14. Moreover, claims 15 and 16 include additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claim 14, render those claims further distinct and nonobvious over the references or record. Accordingly, claims 15 and 16 should likewise be deemed allowable.

Independent claim 17 is specifically directed to the embodiment described in Fig. 3c. Claim 17 recites an arrangement that includes of a current control device (PTC), a resonance

inductor (LRes), and a heating transformer that includes a primary coil (Lhp). Claim 17 recites that the current control device (PTC) is coupled to a tap on the resonance inductor (LRes), and that the primary coil (Lhp) is coupled between the current control device (PTC) and the seventh terminal (26). None of the references appear to disclose or suggest the aforementioned structure. Accordingly, claim 17 should likewise be deemed allowable.

Claims 18 and 19 are dependent on claim 17, and are therefore allowable on the same basis as claim 17. Moreover, claims 18 and 19 include additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claim 17, render those claims further distinct and nonobvious over the references or record. Thus, claims 18 and 19 should likewise be deemed allowable.

Accordingly, new claims 11-19 are believed to be in a condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, passing of this case is now in order. Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's agent by telephone if such communication may be helpful in the further examination of this case. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On April 14, 2005
(Date of Deposit)

Kenneth D. Labudda, Reg. No. 41,134
Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered rep.

Kenneth D. Labudda 04/14/05
Signature Date

Respectfully submitted,

Uwe Liess, et al.

by: Kenneth D. Labudda 04/14/2005
Kenneth D. Labudda
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 41,134
OSRAM SYLVANIA INC.
Phone: (847) 726-6448
FAX: (847) 726-6599